

REMARKS

The applicant has amended claim 17 and added claims 32 and 33. Claims 17-33 are currently pending.

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17-21 and 31 stand rejected as being anticipated by Long et al. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Long et al. discloses that all of the gaps between the poles have a uniform width in the peripheral or circumferential direction (i.e., the width of all the gaps in Long is consistent from pole to pole). This arrangement provides a structure in which the poles are uniformly positioned or spaced from one another. The uniform gaps are marked as reference numeral 18 in Figures 1A, 2, and 3. Long et al. fails to disclose the claimed structure in which the gaps between the poles have different widths.

In sharp contrast, claim 17 was amended to set forth the poles as defining a plurality of gaps, two or more of the gaps having different widths. This amended language clarifies the term "asymmetrically positioned" and is consistent with the specification, which defines asymmetrical positioning as a structure having a distance or gap between neighboring poles that is not consistent, but varies from pole to pole in the peripheral direction (see, e.g., page 2, lines 22-23; page 3, lines 12-13; page 5, lines 15-16; and page 7, lines 20-33, and Figures 2 and 3).

Therefore, Long et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed structure, and the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Long et al. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal from the pending rejection.

B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-30 stand rejected as being obvious over Long et al. in view of Susumu. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Long et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed structure in which the poles define a plurality of gaps, two or more of the gaps having different widths. Susumu also fails to teach or suggest such a structure. In fact, Susumu does not disclose any teaching whatsoever regarding the gap between poles along the peripheral edge of a rotor. Therefore, no combination of Long et al. and Susumu will result in the claimed structure in which the poles define a plurality of gaps, two or more of the gaps having different widths.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from the cited references, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

C. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references. The applicant requests allowance of all the pending claims and advancement of this patent application toward issuance.

Please note that there may be reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references in addition to those discussed herein. The applicant reserves the right to raise any such arguments in the future. Please contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions that can be addressed to advance the claims to allowance or otherwise advance the patent application towards issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: May 27, 2003



John C. Reich
Reg. No. 37,703
JCR:nma

